

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, as amended, remain herein.

Editorial changes have been made in claims 1-5. New claims 6-10, parallel to claims 1 and 3-5 have been added; whereas claim 1 recites "rotary display member," claim 6 recites "stationary display member." Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

1. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Chien U.S. Patent Application 2002/0003697. Claim 3 has been cancelled, thereby mooting its rejection.

The presently claimed pattern display apparatus includes a pattern display apparatus including a rotary (claim 1) or stationary (claim 6) display member and flexible EL device on outer surface thereof. These arrangements are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Chien '697 as allegedly disclosing a pattern display apparatus including a rotary (Fig. I) or stationary (Fig. 1-E) display member and flexible EL device on outer surface thereof. However, in Fig. I, Chien '697 discloses

Serial No.: 10/664,036

the organic EL device being fixed at a central portion, away from a driving gear set so that the organic EL device does not revolve, and instead, an outer reflector revolves, as described at Chien '697, paragraph 0026. Also, Chien '367, Fig. E, which shows an organic EL device located in a belt member, does not clearly show a rotary display having a flexible EL device on outer surface. Thus, Chien '697 does not disclose or suggest applicants' flexible organic EL device located on an outer surface of a rotary display member.

For the foregoing reasons, Chien '697 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Chien '697 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/664,036

2. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chien '697 and Garcia et al U.S. Patent 6,720,203.

Claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for the reasons explained herein for claim 1.

Moreover, the Office Action cites Garcia '203 as allegedly teaching a top sealing layer. However, Garcia '203 does not provide the deficiencies of Chien '697 explained herein.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Chien '697 nor Garcia '203 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chien '367, Garcia '203 and Kawasaki et al. U.S. Patent 6,281,552.

Serial No.: 10/664,036

Claim 5, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for the reasons explained herein for claim 1.

Moreover, the Office Action cites Kawasaki '552 as allegedly teaching an insulating layer located between the first and second electrodes and formed in a predetermined pattern in order to limit light emission to a predetermined area. However, Kawasaki '552 does not provide a flexible organic EL device located on an outer surface of the display member, or other deficiencies of Chien '697 and Garcia '203 explained herein.

For the foregoing reasons, none of Chien '697, Garcia '203 or Kawasaki '552 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in any of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/664,036

All claims 1-9 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

July 29, 2004

Date


Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177
Robert N. Wieland
Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: DAIN:754

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220